

**Appl. No.** : 10/672,906  
**Filed** : September 25, 2003

### **REMARKS**

In response to the final Office Action dated December 30, 2005 and the Advisory Action mailed April 17, 2006, Applicant has amended the application as above. No new matter is added by the amendments as discussed below. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the remarks set forth below.

#### **Discussion of Claim Amendment**

Claim 1 has been amended. Upon the entry of the amendment, Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. The amendment to Claim 1 is supported by the specification at paragraph [0052] and Figure 3B, for example. Furthermore, the claim amendment is to adopt the Examiner's suggestions. Thus, no new matter is added by the amendment. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendment.

#### **Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Tsubo (U.S. Patent No. 6,831,295). Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable over the cited prior art as discussed below.

#### **Standard of Prima facie Obviousness**

In order to provide a *prima facie* showing of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *See, e.g., In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974); MPEP 2143.03.

#### **Discussion of Patentability of Independent Claim 1**

Independent Claim 1 recites, among other things, that each pixel electrode is divided into a plurality of sub pixel electrodes, and *a gap is located between each of adjacent sub pixel electrodes*. Applicant respectfully submits that the above-indicated features of the claimed invention are neither taught nor suggested by the cited prior art.

**1. Neither AAPA nor Tsubo teaches or suggests “each pixel electrode is divided into a plurality of sub pixel electrodes, and a gap is located between each of adjacent sub pixel electrodes” recited in Claim 1**

AAPA does not disclose the above-recited features of the claimed invention. AAPA discloses a single pixel electrode (308) in each pixel region. *See Figures 2A-2C of this application.* Since AAPA teaches only one pixel electrode (308) in each pixel region, AAPA cannot, and does not, teach “each pixel electrode is *divided into a plurality of sub pixel electrodes*” recited in Claim 1. Furthermore, AAPA does not teach “a gap is located between each of adjacent sub pixel electrodes” recited in Claim 1. In view of AAPA’s teaching of a single pixel electrode (308), the prior art cannot, and does not, teach the gap associated feature of the claimed invention. *See Figures 2A and 2B of this application.* Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that AAPA does not teach or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

Tsubo does not teach or suggest the above-indicated features recited in Claim 1. Tsubo discloses a single pixel electrode (13) in each pixel region. *See Figures 5, 6A-6C, 7-9, 10A-10B and 11-14 of Tsubo.* Again, since Tsubo teaches only one pixel electrode (13) in each pixel region, the Tsubo reference cannot, and does not, teach “each pixel electrode is *divided into a plurality of sub pixel electrodes, and a gap is located between each of adjacent sub pixel electrodes*” recited in Claim 1. *See Figures 11 and 13 of Tsubo.* As discussed above, the Examiner confirmed that the claimed invention having the gap associated feature would be allowable over the cited prior art.

**2. Combination of AAPA and Tsubo Does Not Teach the Above-Recited Features of the Claimed Invention**

As discussed above, neither AAPA nor Tsubo teaches or suggests “each pixel electrode is *divided into a plurality of sub pixel electrodes, and a gap is located between each of adjacent sub pixel electrodes*” recited in Claim 1. Thus, even if AAPA and Tsubo were combined, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach the above-recited features of the claimed invention. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 is allowable over AAPA and Tsubo.

**Appl. No.** : **10/672,906**  
**Filed** : **September 25, 2003**

**Discussion of Patentability of Dependent Claims**

Claims 2-6 depend from base Claim 1, and further define additional technical features of the present invention. In view of the patentability of their base claim, and in further view of their additional technical features, Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are patentable over the prior art of record.

Appl. No. : 10/672,906  
Filed : September 25, 2003



CONCLUSION

In view of Applicant's foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

6/29/06

By: \_\_\_\_\_

John M. Carson  
Registration No. 34,303  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550

2711508  
062606